

REMARKS

Basis for the Amended Claims

The Attorney for Applicant certifies that, to the best of his knowledge, these substitute claims contain no new matter.

The basis for the new/revised claims is the same as was stated in Applicant's response to Examiner's first office action (the basis for claim 14 is the same as 7 in the first office action response; the basis for claim 29 is the same as 8 in the first office action response; etc.). These new claims are simply modifications or refinements of the revised claims in Applicant's response to Examiner's first office action in that, pursuant to Examiner's recommendations, they were modified to read as means plus function claims and they were revised to include more specific embodiments of the invention.

Examiner, during his in-person interview with Applicant, did not state by rule or example what level of specificity would be required; Examiner simply indicated that he wanted greater specificity in how the invention would be used in practical applications than was in the original claims. Applicant has addressed this ambiguity by including different levels of specificity in the claims.

Response to the Rejections

For the Claims rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §101, because Examiner concluded that none of the claims are limited to practical applications, Applicant has now modified said claims, pursuant to the suggestion of Examiner, so that the claims are directed to practical applications, thus the claims are no longer directed to "abstract ideas" but rather they are now directed to "useful, concrete and tangible" results, with specificity, and given that, by amending the claims, the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection has been eliminated, the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection is no longer germane.

Examiner rejected Applicant's arguments filed 11/30/2006 because the amended claims "did not invoke Section 112, sixth paragraph by using a means-plus-function format or step-for format."

Applicant has changed every new claim into means-plus-function formats; thus, these proposed claims are now in the proper format, §112, sixth paragraph has now been invoked; therefore, the §101 rejections, and the §112 rejections arising from said §101 rejections are no longer applicable.

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentability over the prior art. Therefore, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

Respectfully submitted,



Gary Pisner, Esq. bar Id: 34096
Pisner & Pisner, Attorneys
12111 Fairfax Hunt Road,
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
Tel: 703-322-1432
Fax: 703-842-5340
E-mail: gpisner@aptcs.com

Certificate of Mailing under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on September 7, 2007.

